

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 8 Part 30

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

Round VIII -30

Back < > Next

|Sina wrote:|

|What is happening dear Edip? Why is it that I feel like talking to an answering machine? You have completely neglected my questions and like all your fellow co-religionists resorted to copy-pasting. What is the relevance of these to our discussion? Where are the answers to my questions?|

I know, after receiving all my answers you will be repeating this. You know that if you repeat something many times you will find enough people to believe whatever you are saying. A working political campaign!

You got it all wrong, Ali. Go ask someone who knows English better than you the difference between "Reform in Islam" and "Islamic Reform." You indicated that you have read some of my articles at my website. If you have done so, you should have learned that I do not suggest what you are trying to put in my mouth. Perhaps, you are deliberately trying to misrepresent my position to divert from the main issues. You have somehow succeeded many times by resorting to your favorite silly storybooks, and copying and pasting them here.

Dear Edip. In your website <http://www.yuksel.org/> On the top of your handsome picture it says "The Islamic Reformer". So what is it that you want to reform? No I am afraid I do not understand what you mean by "Reform in Islam" and "Islamic Reform". Can you please explain? If what you mean is to change the world according to Islamic precepts that is not reform. That is propagation of Islam and all other Muslims are hard at work doing it. Why then you are the reformer and not them? If you mean to reform Islam, then let us know what is your authority. You must have some divine rank and revelations to be able to reform what Muhammad wrote.

Martin Luther reformed the church not the Bible. But your problem is the Quran and not the Ummah.

| |

|---|

|Sina wrote:|

|The verses 25 and 26 talk about the defeat of the Muslims in Hunain, despite their great numbers and then their victory, the details of this event is in Sira and really does not belong to this Sura. How would we know what happened in Hunain and with whom Muslims fought without consulting the Sira? Isn't this another proof that the Quran, without hadith and Sira is incomprehensible?|

Again: left foot, right foot; wet foot, dry foot; true foot, lie foot; here comes the evilgelical-sunni sly soot!

| |

|---|

|Sina wrote:|

|The verse 29 starts with قَاتِلُوا this can only be translated as fight and not fight (back). It is an offensive order and not defensive. It is qatilu not dafeu. The verse goes on to say fight them until they pay الْجِزْيَةَ jizyah. This word derives from jaza. It means fine and punishment the plural of that is mojazat. It does not mean compensation. The correct word for compensation is mokafat.|

After another lengthy diversion with a load of trashy references and lies, you finally make an argument, though a funny argument. First, the word MOKAFAT is modern Arabic and is not used in the Quran and hadith books. You are confusing a Modern Arabic word with classic Arabic. Second, the JAZA means recompense, reward. In fact, in haste I missed a better English term for Jizya: reparation. Various nouns and verbs derived from the same root, JaZaYa is mentioned in the Quran 118 times. If we exclude the JiZYa of verse 29 for the sake of the argument, NOT IN A SINGLE occurrence it has anything to do with TAXation. Furthermore, in dozens of verses this word is used to describe REWARD and COMPENSATION.

Here are some verses that falsify your claim 3:144-145; 10:4; 12:22; 12:74-75; regarding the modern Arabic word MOKAFAT 14:51; 18:88; 20:76; 28:14; 33:24; 37:80,105,110,121,131; 39:34; 55:60; and more.

First, your linguistic sources are little better than your hadith sources, but it is still the third rate source. Any person can go write an article and definition in wikipedia.org, including you and any of your followers. From your MOKAFAT, now your knowledge of classic Arabic becomes suspect, and from using wikipedia.org I know your level of academic gullibility becomes an issue. Please be serious Ali.

Besides, no scholar who is familiar with transformation of language will put his or her full trust in a dictionary, even if it is the most reputable dictionary. There are some Arabic words have changed their meaning through time and it does not take to be a rocket scientist or a monotheist to notice the traces of such change. We have many examples of such a change in English too. For instance, you cannot claim that a renaissance poet

was homosexual because in his poems he called himself GAY several times. Wikipedia.org indeed does a good job in listing the early meaning of the word GAY. However, it fails to define word ELOI or ELI one of the few Aramaic words used in English translation of the Bible (Mat 27:46; Mrk 15:34). If I claim that the etymological origin of Arabic Elahi (my god) is the same with Aramaic Eloi (my god) or the origin of Allah (the god) is the same as the Aramaic Alohim (the god), you may refute me by referring to wikipedia.org, which defines Eloi as of the two post-human races mentioned in the novel The Time Machine. You might claim that Jesus was asking help from Eloi not Marlocks who lived in the year 802701 AD! Or you might just refer the quotation from Biblical verses and claim that it just means the God of Anglo-Saxon version!

The Devil's Califs of Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties had too much interest and motivation to change the meaning of a Quranic word and they had many hadith and sunnah fabricators under their service. So, changing the meaning of JIZYA from reparation to tax perhaps took some time, but considering their success in changing much important principles and practices it was not that difficult.